

University of Dayton
eCommons

[All Committee Minutes](#)

[Academic Senate Committees](#)

1-18-2013

Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2013-01-18

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee, "Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2013-01-18" (2013). *All Committee Minutes*. 189.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/189

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate Committees at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact fprice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

Minutes of the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate
January 18, 2013
SC 106

Present: Paul Benson, Paul Bobrowski, Deb Bickford, Jim Dunne, Laura Leming, Leno Pedrotti, Paul Vanderburgh, John White

Absent Vinod Jain, Kurt Mosser, Karen Swisher, Anthony Whaley

Announcements:

Sarah Kerns has removed herself from the Academic Senate and the Academic Policies Committee. Student Government is trying to find another student member for the APC.

The next meeting of the APC will be on Friday January 25 from 2-3 pm in a room to be determined.

The business before the APC in the Spring 2013 term includes

- CAPCC Oversight
- Disposition of the Competency Program requirements under the Common Academic Program
- Program/Department Proposal Process Revision
- Physician Assistant Curriculum Review
- TESOL Graduate Certificate

(Leno Pedrotti noted that he inadvertently did not include the bullet with the disposition of the Competency Program requirements in the Spring 2013 business listed in the agenda for this 1-18-2013 meeting.

Old Business:

Program/Department Proposal Process Revision

Leno Pedrotti reported that he had drafted a Senate document tentatively numbered DOC 13-01 and titled “Undergraduate Degree Program and Department Change Process” intended to replace DOC 94-10 “Initiation, Suspension, Reactivation and Discontinuation of Undergraduate Academic Degree Programs”, DOC 12-05 “Undergraduate Degree Program Proposal Process: Amendment to Senate Document 94-10”, and DOC 12-08 “Department Proposal Process.” He stated that the purposes of creating a single policy document to govern the initiation, suspension, discontinuation, etc.. of both academic degree programs and academic departments was to simplify the proposal process and to remove some inconsistencies in the flow-of-approval processes listed in the three existing documents.

Leno Pedrotti noted that in drafting DOC 13-01, he had eliminated the section appearing in DOC 12-08 relating to the suspension of academic departments, since there did not seem to be a circumstance under which departments would be suspended. It was agreed that the new policy document should not have a section detailing the suspension of an academic department (but would have a section for suspension of a degree program).

Leno Pedrotti described that the draft document 13-01 covered the creation, suspension, discontinuation, reactivation, and renaming of undergraduate degree programs and the creation, discontinuation, merging, splitting, and renaming of academic departments but did not cover actions related to graduate degree programs. Many academic departments house both undergraduate and graduate degree programs and so actions taken on departments could impact graduate degree programs. Leno Pedrotti stated that DOC 96-03 titled “Guide for the Initiation of a New Graduate Degree Program” is the only Academic Senate policy that he could find that was related to actions on graduate degree programs. Paul Benson and Paul Vanderburgh indicated that recent proposals for the creation of graduate degree programs may not have used the process described in DOC 96-03. Rather, these recent graduate degree program proposals used a format that mirrors the current format required by the Ohio Board of Regents, which approves graduate degree programs. After some discussion it was agreed that the draft DOC 13-01 should be expanded to include actions taken on graduate degree programs. Paul Vanderburgh agreed to discuss the proper proposal format and approval-process for such actions with Leno Pedrotti, who would draft the expanded version of DOC 13-01.

It was agreed that the expanded DOC 13-01 would not include any sections related to actions taken on certificates.

Leno Pedrotti provided a handout listing the various proposal approval-flow processes detailed in DOCs 94-10, 12-05, 12-08, and 96-03. He noted minor inconsistencies in the processes detailed in these documents. After some discussion it was agreed that the following approval-process flow could be used for all but the actions on graduate degree programs.

Approval Process

While the College or the Schools may have additional and varied requirements, the following are the necessary steps for approval of the proposal

1. College or School
2. Executive Committee of the Academic Senate/Academic Senate (See below for details.)
3. Provost → Provost Council
4. President → President's Council
5. Board of Trustees

Early consultation with the Provost's office is expected prior to formal submission of a proposal to begin the approval process. Each step above may require a response document addressing concerns raised before approval is granted. If significant changes are made, the proposal will be returned to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for additional review.

Role of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and the Academic Senate in the Approval Process

If the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate determines that a proposal has significant University-wide impact it sends the proposal to the Academic Senate for legislative action. In this case, the action of the Academic Senate action is considered a recommendation to the Provost with regard to the proposal. If the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate determines that the proposal does not have University-wide impact, it may forward the proposal directly to the Provost with its recommendation. In this case, the recommendation of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate should be reported to the Academic Senate and recorded in the minutes of both the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and the minutes of the Academic Senate. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate may choose to submit the proposal to one or more standing committees to solicit an opinion regarding the disposition of the proposal before submitting the proposal to the Academic Senate or to the Provost. Article II. B. 1. of the Constitution of the Academic Senate states "In considering which policies have significant University-wide impact, the Academic Senate shall analyze how these policies affect items such as program quality, content, economic feasibility, and consonance with the University mission. To be considered University-wide, the policy must apply to more than one educational unit. Legislative Authority shall not extend to the implementation or administration of such policies." Normally, proposals involving the initiation, suspension, discontinuation, or reactivation of degree programs should be sent to the Academic Senate for legislative action since the nature of academic degree programs offered by the University significantly affects the quality and content of the curricular options offered by the University. Normally, proposals involving structural changes to an academic department should be sent to the Academic Senate for legislative action if those changes are linked to changes in degree programs or if those changes impact the curriculum and student enrollment in courses housed in academic units other than the one in which the department is housed. Proposals to rename an academic department or degree program should be sent to the Academic Senate for legislative action if the name change impacts other academic units.

It was agreed that the next draft of DOC 13-01 should have a more descriptive title and a table of contents. Also care should be taken to incorporate the possibility that degree programs may be shared between units. Finally, a section should be added indicating that the list of actions incorporated into DOC 13-10 will not be exhaustive and that other actions (such as the transfer of a degree program between units) could be done with a format that

is similar to the ones detailed in DOC 13-01.

New Business

Curriculum for the Master of Physician Assistant Practice (MPAP)

Leno Pedrotti explained that the timeline for the development and accreditation of the MPAP degree program and the department of Physician Assistant Education required the establishment of the department, hiring of faculty, and allocation of associated resources prior to the finalization of the curriculum of the MPAP program, which took place after the Chair and Director of the Physician Assistant Program was hired. Consequently, at the December 2, 2011 meeting of the Academic Senate DOC 11-04: “Proposal to establish a department of Physician Assistant Education for the purpose of developing the Master of Physician Assistant Practice (MPAP)” was approved with the understanding that the curriculum for this program would have to return to the Senate once it was developed. Leno Pedrotti noted that a detailed description of the curriculum has been sent to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and that the APC is to develop a proposal to bring before the Academic Senate at the February 15 meeting that body.

It was agreed that the MPAP curriculum proposal should include the following sections:

- Explanation of the MPAP program approval process
- Descriptive overview and rationale for the proposed curriculum
- Program prerequisites
- Listing of courses to be taken each semester
- Course Descriptions

A question of the need for legislative action on the curriculum proposal was raised—should the proposal be brought to the Senate for legislative action or simply as the fulfillment of a commitment made in DOC 11-04. It was agreed that the latter might be preferred.

Leno Pedrotti indicated that he would create a draft document describing the MPAP curriculum, obtain feedback on the draft from Susan Wulff, Director of the MPAP program, and send the draft to APC members for consideration by Wednesday January 23. The desirability of quick Senate action on the proposal was noted.

The meeting adjourned at 2:50 pm.

Submitted by Leno Pedrotti